



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,000	11/25/2003	Peter L. Collins	NIHB-2264	6530
45160	7590	02/16/2010	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP			LUCAS, ZACHARIAH	
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2929 ARCH STREET				1648
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/722,000	Applicant(s) COLLINS ET AL.
	Examiner Zachariah Lucas	Art Unit 1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,20,22-24,28,35,36 and 46-48 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,20,22-24,28,35,36 and 46-48 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 20, 22-24, 28, 35, 36, and 46-48 are pending and under consideration in the application.
2. In the prior action, the Final action mailed on October 20, 2009, claims 1, 4, 18-20, 22-24, 28, 35-48, 64, and 65 were pending in the application; with claims 37-45, 64, and 65 withdrawn from consideration; and claims 1, 4, 18-20, 22-24, 28, 35, 36, and 46-48 under consideration and rejected.
3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 20, 2010 has been entered.

In the submission, the Applicant amended claim 1; and cancelled claims 4, 18, 19, 37-45, 64, and 65.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: ATTENUATED CHIMERIC RESPIRATORY SYNCYTIAL VIRUS

Art Unit: 1648

5. The specification is objected to for containing referring to sequences without also identifying them by the sequence identifier assigned to them in the sequence listing as required by 37 CFR 1.821(d). See, Figure 3 and page 23 (including the brief description of Fig. 3); Figure 6 and pages 22-23 (brief description of Figure 6); Figure 7 and page 23; Figure 17 (page 26); Figure 18 and page 26; and Figures 20-26 and pages 26-29 (the brief description of these Figures). The examiner would like to bring the applicant's attention to the following excerpt from MPEP §2422.03:

37 CFR 1.821(d) requires the use of the assigned sequence identifier in all instances where the description or claims of a patent application discuss sequences regardless of whether a given sequence is also embedded in the text of the description or claims of an application. This requirement is also intended to permit references, in both the description and claims, to sequences set forth in the "Sequence Listing" by the use of assigned sequence identifiers without repeating the sequence in the text of the description or claims. Sequence identifiers can also be used to discuss and/or claim parts or fragments of a properly presented sequence. For example, language such as "residues 14 to 243 of SEQ ID NO: 23" is permissible and the fragment need not be separately presented in the "Sequence Listing." Where a sequence is embedded in the text of an application, it must be presented in a manner that complies with the requirements of the sequence rules.

The applicant is therefore required to amend the specification to comply with 37 CFR 1.821(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. (**New Rejection**) Claims 1, 20, 22-24, 28, 35, 36, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 is treated as

representative. This claim reads on an infectious chimeric RSV comprising a genome having a mutation in the L gene identified as D1183D. It is not clear what the mutation is.

It appears that the claim should read on a mutation encoding D1183E in the L gene. See e.g., page 134 (Table 36) of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. **(Prior Rejections- Withdrawn)** Claims 1, 4, 14, 18, 19, 22-24, 28, 35, 36, and 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke (U.S. 5,840,520) and Collins (PNAS 92: 11563-67), and Murphy et al. (U.S. 5,922,326), and further in view of Wertz et al. (U.S. 5,789,229). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke, Collins, Murphy, and Wertz as applied above, and further in view of the teachings of Connors et al. (Virology 208:478-84- reference CH in the July 2008 IDS) and Randolph et al. (US 5,932,222). In view of the amendments to the claims, the rejections are withdrawn.

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned

Art Unit: 1648

with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. (**New Rejection**) Claims 1, 20, 22-24, 28, 35, 36, and 46-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-78 of U.S. Patent No. 6,699,476. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each of the claim limitations of the present claims are also found in the claims of the patent. The present claims therefore represent an obvious embodiment of the patented inventions.

Conclusion

11. No claims are allowed.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachariah Lucas whose telephone number is (571)272-0905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert B. Mondesi can be reached on 571-272-0956956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Zachariah Lucas/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1648